

**Ameet Patel****From:** Nguyen, Jennifer Thuy (AU2629) [JenniferThuy.Nguyen@USPTO.GOV]**Sent:** Thursday, August 21, 2008 2:22 PM**To:** Ameet Patel**Subject:** PTO-303 Advisory Action Before Filing of Appeal Brief

Un-Official Advisory Action

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/830,073	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KURTENBACH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JENNIFER T. NGUYEN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2629	

**–The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –**

THE REPLY FILED 28 July 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later.  
In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
  - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
- NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1, 4-11, 13, 15-17, 19, 21, 23 and 25.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d) (1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

09/26/2008

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

12. Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement(s)*. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_

13. Other: in the Remarks, Applicants stated that "Tanimoto is relate to inputting data on a 2D plane...does not contemplate inputting data in 3D space" and "the modification of Kent in view of Tanimoto would merely describe positioning a cursor in a two-dimension plane but not mapping the affect to a 3D position". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Kent teaches an input configuration (i.e., fingers, gloved fingers, stylus...) coupled to the volumetric display output configuration (i.e., touching three dimensional display) and comprising a passive sensor (1908) allowing a user to affect the display content through the passive sensor by mapping the affect to a 3D position of a image (col. 77, line 62 to col. 78, line 29). Kent teaches inputting data on the display in 3D space this limitation does not need to rely on Tanimoto. Kent does not specifically teach an image on display is a cursor. Tanimoto teaches a stylus control an image such as a cursor on touch screen (fig. 12A, col. 20, lines 7-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the cursor as taught by Tanimoto in the system of Kent in order to allow user to interactive with the display apparatus more easily and efficiently. The combination of Kent and Tanimoto teaches all the claimed limitations of claim 1. Moreover, Applicants submitted that the cited art fails to describe said input configuration comprising an input device moving in three dimensions on a surface of said display". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Kent teaches an input configuration coupled to the volumetric display output configuration and allowing a user to affect the display content said input configuration comprising an input device moving in three dimensions on a surface of said display (col. 13, lines 63-67, col. 77, line 62 to col. 78, line 29). One touching object on 3D display can be sensed by a gloved fingers moving by the user.

/Richard Hjerpe/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629